9/2/14

Dear Sylvia,

I've gone over the galleys of your piece, the sought addition and Belin's incredible stupidity. There is not much to say. Belin would appear to be one of those less familiar with his own and the Commission's work. But the real question is partly as you say, he tilts at imaginary windmills, and partly that the uniformed reader will see only the lance, not that there is no windmill even.

If this appears, I'd like to know so I can address a horter piece, particularly since he avoids slandering me, which I regard as discrimination. I think it is very ungentlemanly for Belin to pick on a woman and a half-man. Seriously, I'd like to have a bit of fun with him, and did he set himself up!

With all this space, and all his wasted, you will be taxed to get in what you asked in rebuttal, so I suggest no request for addition. But I'd like to poke fun at him. Just on his stuff, not yours at all. No mention of anything but what he said is needed. He doesn't even know the testimony he took!

And then there is the editing of his question to change the sense of Mrs. Rowland's reply. I mean, how much more "independent" can one be? Especially when she said hers waxx in error and needed changing (WWII).

Yours is more than adequate after the editing. They do have to worry not about the cost of losing a suit but that of defending one.

Should you ever do this over, a few small suggestions (not for now): You should change the beginning of the 12/9 thing because it is not really accurate. I beoieve I have gone into this enough. Cut yourself free, entirely, from that miniman.

Same column: bottom, Carolyn Srnold. This is erroneous and it is repeated several times. A beautiful case for Belin, by the way, for he compounded the lie. Carolyn Arnold really said 12:25. Both of these reports were brought to light in PW.

It is imprecise, unfair and deceptive to say that Givens "furnished" an affidavit. What actually happened is that he swore to what was prepared for him. A better word, were you to change but one, would be two, to change "furnished by" to "taken from". But the connotation would still be wrong.

On the first page of his tinnif, the bottom half, Belin mis-cites his own work four times. The oaf doesn't even know the testimony he took-or worse, deliberately misrepresents it.

Refreshing, after what others have said, to know that we have been "silent" about the Tippit killing!

Good to get these whores out of bed. Belin says he went to the FBI lab, something never before disclosed. Dick should have unloaded on what we found by study of the product of the comparison miscropse work.

He sure is reluctant about the Arnolds (4). And imagine all the time I've spent looking at the Warren Report without seeing his signature (6). Of course he is correct in saying that the clipboard was found "after" the assassination (13)! It was, indeed, "after"! So, I'd like to have some fun. This is but a bit of it. Let me know if and when it is to appear. Then I'll write the TO.

Best,